

## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Offic

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

VB

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	I	FIRST NAMED INV	ENTOR	,	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
_	08/942,369	10/02/9	7 CHEN	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		C	226/213
		£					
	022249		НМ	12/1025	$\neg$		EXAMINER
,	LYON AND L	YON LLP			1	MORAN,	M
	SUITE 4700						
	633 WEST F	IFTH STREE	T			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	LOS ANGELE	S CA 90071	-20 <i>6€</i> -			1623	23
			*			DATE MAILED:	10/25/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

## Application No.

08/942,369

Marjorie Moran

Applicant(s)

Chen et al

Advisory Action

Examiner

Group Art Unit 1623

	E PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]
	a) expires months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	b) a expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
X	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on Oct 18, 1999 (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
Ap but	plicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Oct 18, 1999</u> has been considered with the following effect, tis NOT deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:
	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	will not be entered because:
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium,
X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium,
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed:
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed:  Claims objected to:  Claims rejected: 20-24 and 26  The proposed drawing correction filed on
□ <b>※</b>	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  The examiner maintains that the prior art of record makes obvious a method using a uropathogenic specific medium, wherein EDBERG supplies enablement for such a medium. The examiner further maintains that one skilled (see below)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed:  Claims objected to:  Claims rejected: 20-24 and 26